INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

fense! Witnesses	Page
Grabennik, Kuzma (resumed)	38299
Direct (cont'd) by General Vasiliev	38299
Cross by Mr. Furness	38307
MORNING RECESS	38322
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Furness	38323
NOON RECESS	38338
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Furness	38339
(Witness excused)	38340
Bykov, Afinogen Erastovich	38359
Direct by General Vasiliev	38359
AFTERNOON RECESS	38363
Direct (cont'd) by General Vasiliev	38370
Cross by Mr. Blakeney	38372
Questien by the President of the Tribunal, Sir William Webb	38380
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Blakeney	38381

INDEX

er

EXHIBITS

1	Doc.	Def.	Pros.	Description Ident.	In Evidence
	3294		3855	Certificate of the Mili- tary Topographic De- partment of the USSR General Staff with geo- graphical maps published in different countries of the world attached there- to which show the correct border line in the Khalkin- Gol Area	38344
			3856	Map entitled "Latest Great Map of the Chinese Republic" 38352	
	29930		3856-A	Photostatic portion thereof	38352
* * *	3151		38.57	Affidavit of Afinogen Erastovich Bykov	38360

Tuesday, 27 January 1948 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930. Appearances: For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, Member from the Republic of China, not sitting from 1300 to 1600. For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before. (English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Greenberg & Yelden

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PPISIDENT: All the accused are present except SHIRATORI, who is represented by counsel. We have a certificate from the prison surgeon at Sugamo certifying that he is ill and unable to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

General Vasiliev. You had not finished reading that affidavit. I did not appreciate that fact yesterday afternoon when we adjourned.

KUZMAY. GREBENNIK, called as a
witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the
stand and testified through Russian interpreters

as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

GENERAL VASILIEV: Now the interpreters will continue translating the English version.

being guarded just as it was prior to the outbreak of hostilities. It runs as provided for by the Hunchun Protocol of 1886 along the watershed, i.e., along the hilltops which form a mountain range on the western bank of Lake Khassan. The eastern slope of the

Zaozernaya Hill belongs to the Soviet Union while the western slope is Manchurian.

"To determine the border on the terrain in that area is no problem, and our border guards knew precisely where the border ran. Both before and after the fighting in the vicinity of Lake Khassan this border line was in full conformity with the data as shown on the map attached to the Hunchun Protocol of 1886.

"Major-General Grebennik."

I ask that the witness be shown exhibit No. 2642-B.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: This is a sketch map produced by the defense during the examination of the witness MIURA, Kazuichi, the sketch map of operations in the vicinity of Lake Khassan on July 29, 1938.

I may explain to you, Mr. Witness, that according to the testimony of former Japanese General TANAKA, Ryukichi, heavy semi-circles indicate Soviet trenches--

THE PRESIDENT: Well, now he knows something.

He would have to be told that the semi-circles indicate

Soviet trenches.

MR. FURNESS: That is my objection, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, I object to the asking of additional questions. An elaborate affidavit has been prepared and could have covered this subject; and on the basis of previous rulings by this Court I object to additional testimony in this form.

THE PRESIDENT: I do not recollect that we have ever refused to allow one or two additional questions. Certainly a number of questions would be objectionable.

MR. FURNESS: I refer to the rulings made by the Tribunal when the witness Batarshin was called to the witness stand. These rulings were made both on the direct examination of the witness and on the redirect examination by Colonel Ivanov.

THE PRESIDENT: I would have to look at the transcript to see whether that ruling covers this particular case. I see no objection to asking one or two questions and we have never refused that. The purpose of requiring an affidavit would be defeated, of course, if we allowed several questions to be asked.

MR. FURNESS: That was the basis for rulings--GENERAL VASILIEV: May I say a few words, sir?

7 8

THE PRESIDENT: We have decided to allow the question.

BY GENERAL VASILIEV (Continued):

Q I will explain to you, Mr. Witness, that according to the testimony of former Japanese General TANAKA, Ryukichi, heavy semi-circles indicate Soviet trenches. The sign to the right of the summit from which a line is drawn to the inscription July 11 indicates a Soviet tank and the cross signs indicate the places of clashes between the Soviet and Japanese troops. This sketch map was drawn up allegedly on July 29 or 30 by a staff officer of the Korean Army, one Major SAITO, for MIURA, Kazuichi. Are the signs on the sketch map clear to you?

A This sketch map is drawn up in a very premature way and it doesn't correspond to the established rules of topography -- elementary rules of topography.

Q Does this map correspond to the actual state of affairs from July 11 to July 29, 1938?

A As I understood from what you were saying, the heavy semi-circle lines indicate the Soviet trenches and east of the Zaozernaya Hill a Soviet tank is shown. This sketch map doesn't correspond to the actual state of affairs in that area because prior to July 29 in the Khassan Lake area there were no clashes, and prior to

the morning of July 31 there were no military clashes on the Zaozernaya Hill as well. As to the clash which is shown on the map and pertains to July 11, it doesn't correspond to the actual occurrence in that area.

Q Mr. Witruss, when did the Soviet side commence fortification works on the Zaozernaya Hill and what kind of works?

A No fortification works were carried on on the Zaozernaya Hill because it is categorically forbidden by the instruction of the Chief of Department of the Border Guard Corps of the USSR and that would have shown contempt to the neighboring state. As to the trenches which are shown west of the state border line, that doesn't correspond to the actual state of affairs because the Soviet border guards never crossed the border line. Such actions, that is, the crossing of the state border line, would have violated the sovereignty of the neighboring state, which we always respect.

The tank which is shown east of the hill is a pure invention because prior to July 31 there were no tanks in the Lake Khassan area within the zone of 60-70 kilometers; and any man with an elementary knowledge of military questions who could read a map would

have drawn the conclusion that a tank couldn't approach that place because the eastern slope of the Zaozernaya Hill is very steep, more than forty-five degrees, and this place is not accessible to tanks.

9,120

Q Have you completed your answer?

A And, therefore, Lis sketch map doesn't correspond to the actual state of affairs and is a pure invention.

Q I have a last question for you. When was the Soviet border guard outpost established on the Zaozernaya Hill?

established on the Zaozernaya Hill from the time of the Soviet Border Quard Corps was established. According to the instruction of the Chief of the Department of the Soviet Border Guard Corps the state borderline is guarded by the Soviet border guard troops constantly, day and night, on the whole length of the borderline. That is, each meter of the state borderline is constantly guarded — of the Soviet state borderline. In 1937, when I took over the sector of the borderline which was guarded by the 59th Border Guard Detachment, I was on the Zaozernaya Hill, and I personally saw their border guard posts, and I inspected how well they new their task.

GENERAL VASILIEV: The defense may now crossexamine. I have no more questions for the witness. THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: If the Court please, as the

2

4

7

8

9

11

12 13

14

16

18

19

21

22

24

GREBENNIK 38,306

Court will recall, at the end of the defense case I reserved a witness. He dealt with this particular instant. My cross-examination will, in part, be based on the assumption that I will be able to introduce evidence to reply to the answers of this witness.

THE PRESIDENT: You intend to keep it within the limits of his affidavit, I suppose, Major Furness?

ER. FURNESS: Vithin the limits of his affidavit and his additional questions, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we cannot stop your cross-examination on those lines. You mean to tell us you will observe what is certainly the British rule, that your questions will be such that you will be able to prove that subject matter if necessary, or you hope to be able to, and they are not mere speculative questions. I see no objection to the course you propose.

AR. FURNESS: Thank you, sir, I am cross-examining, I understand, generally for the defense.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, there is some objection to the course you propose, and I do not quite understand it, and I would like to do so. The course you have outlined to me is strictly legitimate, if I understand you, and I think I do.

MR. FURNESS: All I can say, your Honor, is

4 5

7 8

GREBENNIK

that your questions indicate that you do. CROSS-EXAMINATION

2

BY MR. FURNESS:

Q General, at the time of the incident, how many men were under your command?

CROSS

A During the battle of July 31 in the Lake
Khassan area, 92 border guards, one company -- one
infantry company and one tank platoon were under my
command -- infantry company of the Soviet armed
forces.

Q Were the number of border guards increased at all between the 1st of July and the 31st?

A Yes, between the 1st and the 31st of July the number of border guards increased.

Q How much did they increase and when was the increase nade?

A I have no exact recollection, but there was a considerable increase. Usually, the border patrols consisted of three, five or ten men.

Q They were increased to 92 from what figure on approximately what date?

A That is what I was going to answer. The increase of the number of border guards took place starting from July 29, 1933, that is, from the beginning of the hostilities in that area on the Bezymyan-

5

7

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

18

19

21

22

naya Hill.

Q And from what number did they increase? They were 92 at that time. What were they before the increase was made?

The number of border guards was increasing gradually in accordance with the situation. At first we had only 0.P.'s, three men on the Bezymyannaya Hill -- on the Zaozernaya Hill, and then, gradually, in accordance with the situation, the number was increasing.

11

1

2

3

7

9

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

. 24

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q	I would like to get an answer to my question.
You said	you had 92. How many did you have before any
	was made as a result of the changing situa-
tion?	

CROSS

(In Russian).

MR. FURNESS: I would like to hear what he said.

THE WITNESS: I have already replied to your , estion, Mr. Defense Counsel.

SOVIET INTERPRETIR: That was all he said. THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: The ambiguity arises from the fact that it is not quite clear whether the defense counsel means the total number of forces the General had at his command or the number of forces at Zaozernaya Hill. I suggest that the defense counsel make his question more clear.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness must be the judge of what is clear and what is not.

MR. FURNESS: It will be perfectly clear what answer is wanted if these interruptions continue.

What were the total number of border guards under your command on July 1?

I haven't quite understood your question, Mr. Counsel. I don't know whether you mean the border

guards on the Zaozernaya Hill or where the advance occurred, or the entire detachment which held the sector of 236 kilometers.

Q Well, tell us how many men were under your command for the entire sector?

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I suggest that the witness bear in mind that if it is a matter of military secret the witness shouldn't reply to this question.

THE PRESIDENT: Now, he has to take these grounds of privilege. It is for the witness to say that, General, in our courts at all events. We must assume that he would not be entrusted with military secrets without appreciating the fact, and in his position he can be trusted to claim any objection or claim any privilege.

MR. FURNESS: I suggest, your Honor, that
the Soviet prosecutor has asked me to clarify my
question, and I have tried to clarify it, and now
he objects to my clarifying it. I suggest, too, that
any questions with regard to July, 1938, can't affect
the security of the Soviet Union very much at the
present time.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I think that the clarification made by the President of the court makes it

2

5

7

8

10

11

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

24

quite clear to the witness how he should answer.

Q All right, how do you act? Do you want to tell us or do you claim privilege in answering the question, how many men were in the sector of 230 miles which your detachment apparently guarded?

I said miles. I meant to say kilometers.

A I can testify now if I am not disturbed, interrupted. But as to the strength of the border guards on the entire sector of the border, I am unable to testify with regard to this matter because it is a matter of security, state security.

MR. FURNESS: All right.

THE WITNESS: I haven't completed my reply, Mr. Counsel.

MR. FURNESS: I am sorry.

A (Continuing) You are interested in the question as to how many body guards there were in the area of the Zaozernaya Hill.

prior to July 1, 1938, this sector of the border was guarded in a normal way, and it was guarded by the usual border guard posts consisting of three to five men. Starting from July 1, when the Japanese troops began to cross the Tuman-Ula River, the garrison was increased, and it was increased gradually, as I told you before, depending upon circumstances, the

2

6

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

July 30, 1938 there were 92 border guards there; and as stated here previously, on the night from July 30 to July 31, 92 border guards, one infantry company of field troops, and tank platoons participated in battle.

Q Do you mean to say that they increased from 3 to 92; is that the effect of your answer?

A Gradually from 3 to 92.

Q And that was over the entire period from July 1 to July 31; is that correct?

A Yes, from July 1 to July 31, 1938.

Q And now whon you refer to Zaozernaya Hill do you include also the parts of the line where fighting took place on July 29?

A Yes, I included the entire sector starting from the Bezymyannaya Hill, the Zaozernaya Hill, and then further to the south where fighting broke out on the morning of July 31, 1938.

Q Now, this infantry platoon which came up on July 31, when did it arrive?

A First of all, this is not a platoon; this is a rifle company, and it arrived on the night from July 30 to July 31, 1938.

Q At what time and hours?

3 4 5

7

9

11

12 13

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

	A It arrived about 23 or 24 hours.
the state of	SOVIET MONITOR: Correction: At 24 hours
or at	0030.
	Q That is 0030 on the morning of July 31; is
that	correct?
	A Just as you say.
	Q From where did it come?
	A They arrived from the field troops from the
direc	ction of Zarechie.
	Q Where did they stort from?
	A It was approximately 10 or 12 kilometers.
	Q Were they making hay when you called for
them	?
	A I don't know that detail. I wasn't interested
in i	t at that time.
	Q Did they come from the Town of Yang-chu?
	A I never heard about that town.
	Q I think the Russian name is Novo-Kievskoye.
	A I don't know; maybe they came from that
town	which you named, but the actual point at which
they	came under my command was Zarechie; and it was
	or 12 kilometers from the place where the hostili-
ties	s occurred.
	SOVIET MINOTOR: Correction. Instead of

actual point, initial position.

That was where they were stationed, was it not? No, they hadn't been stationed there before. 3 They were stationed there when you called for them, were they not? Yes, when I called for them they were 6 stationed there at Zarechie. 7 Now, this tank platoon, when did it arrive? It came under my command at the same time 9 both the infantry company and the tank platoon in 10 Zarechie. 11 Q When did it arrive in the vicinity of 12 13 Changkufeng? A I didn't catch the question. Changkufeng? 14 When did it arrive in the vicinity of Hill 15 16 Zaozernaya? I have answered that already, Mr. Defense 17 18 Counsel. I told you they arrived at 24 hours on July 30, between 24 hours on July 30 or 0030 on July 31 19 20 How many tanks? 21 A A platoon, three tanks. 22 Did any more tanks come up that early morning 23 of July 31? 24 I have stated here before that there was only 25

a tank platoon on July 31, and that tank forces

appeared later on August 6, 1938.

Q Now, when these tanks came up and came under your command, where did they take up a position?

A They took up their initial positions in the vicinity of Hill 68.8, that is, northeast of Bezy-myannaya Hill.

Q And did they go into action that morning?

A Yes, they came into action at dawn of the same morning, but only one tank actually participated in fighting because two tanks couldn't cross the bog which was there.

Q Did any cross the border line as contended by the Russians?

A No, they didn't cross the state border line, and I told you, Mr. Defense Counsel, only one tank approached the border line because the other two didn't participate in the battle.

Q Well, as I understand it, that one tank at all times stayed on the other side of the steep ridge at Changkufeng or Bezymyannaya?

A No, you have misunderstood me, Mr. tounsel.

I have already testified that the tank was not in the area of Zaozernaya Hill, but it was northeast of the Bezymyannaya.

Q It stayed on the other side of Bezymyannaya

3

1

5

7

9

8

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

Hill throughout this time, did it?

A Yes, all the time it was east of the Bezymyannaya Hill.

Q And the slope east of the Bezymyannaya Hill is a steep slope, too, is it?

A No, there was no steep slope there. This slope is quite accessible for tanks.

Q Now, was the Podgornaya outpost under your command?

A Yes, the Podgornaya outpost was under my command.

Q And how far from Changkufeng, from Hill Zaozernaya was that?

A The distance between the Podgornaya outpost and the Bezymyannaya Hill amounted to four or five kilometers.

Q Now, there was an outpost on Hill Zaozernaya, was there not?

A No, this outpost was stationed at their billet in the uninhabited point called Podgornaya.

Q Then you had no outpost whatever on Podgornaya Hill?

when I say outpost I don't mean billet. I mean headquarters or outpost on the hill.

I said Podgornaya. I meant to say Zaozernaya.

4

5

1

2

6

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

I am sorry.

As I have stated before, the Podgornaya outpost is a regular military unit, which was billeted in their permanent billet in the vicinity of the town of Podgornaya. There was a border guard patrol on the Zaozernaya Hill, but these are two different territories.

spratt & Duda

Q Did they have any shelter or any headquarters on Zaozernaya Hill?

A No, there were no headquarters on the Zaozernaya Hill and no shelter, either.

And they had no outpost 150 meters from the state border line, as claimed by the Russians?

A I don't know what contention you are referring to, Mr. Counsel, but I believe I have made myself abundantly clear. The Podgornaya Outpost is a regular military unit and is billeted in a permanent building which was 150 meters away from the town of Podgornaya. This outpost -- I mean, Podgornaya Outpost -- which was four and one-half kilometers from the Zaozernaya Hill, sent out a patrol, border guard patrol, on the Zaozernaya Hill. And the border guard patrol is not a border guard outpost. It is just a border guard patrol.

I am referring, for your information and the information of the Tribunal, to testimony of the witness Tereshkin, who testified there was a border post outpost on Zaozernaya Hill which was located 150 miles from the state border.

- A Probably a confusion of terms.
- Q Do you want to clear it up?

 THE PRESIDENT: Leave it at that.

 MR. FURNESS: All right.

.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he may add something if he desires. We are not interested in the debate continuing because the transcript speaks for itself.

Q Hill Bezymyrnnaya was one of the border hills, was it not, as claimed by the Russians?

A The Bezymyanaya Hill is somewhat to the east from the state border line.

Q Do not the western slopes go down into Manchukuoan territory?

A By no means. The entire territory of this hill is on the Soviet side.

Q Now, in paragraph 4 of your afficavit, you testify to the killing of MATSUSHIMA, Shakuni, and you testify that you captured a notebook. What did that notebook show?

A On the Japanese gendarme which was killed we found a notebook, a camera, a pistol and eight cartridges; and his notebook contained the results of his observations.

Q What were the results of his observation?

A I am unable to outline it accurately and in detail now, but the observations which were set down in his notebook referred to a sector of that area.

Q That is all you remember about it?

A I didn't quite understand your question.

Q That is all you remember about it, is it?

A Yes.

Q All right. You found film in the camera, and you had it developed. What had he taken pictures of?

A Yes, by my order this film was developed, and special protocol was made to that effect. Pictures of Soviet territory turned out on that film, the Zaozernaya Hill eastern slopes, Bezymyannaya Hill, Lake Khassan, and other pictures of terrain.

Because he took pictures, you felt justified in killing him, is that correct?

3

2

5

7

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

10

20

21

22

23

A No. MATSUSHIMA, the Japanese gendarme, was not killed because he took pictures of that area. He was killed because he violated the state border line south of the Zaozernaya Hill in the area of the Dygashelli town, and didn't fulfill the demand of the border guard patrol which was at that place:

RUSSIAN MONITOR: Didn't obey the demand.

Now, on page 5 of your affidavit you testify that the letter which is part of exhibit No. 753, dated July 23, had been shown to you, and you verify its text.

I said page 5. I meant paragraph 5 on page 3 of the English text.

That letter mentions a previous letter dated July 16. Now, was a letter taken by the Soviet border guards about July 16?

A I have received two such letters. The first letter was delivered to me by trespassers of the Soviet border. I don't remember the exact date of delivery, but it was after July 15.

The second letter was left on the Soviet territory by an armed Japanese detachment who had violated the state border, fired at the Soviet border patrol, felled a telephone post of the border guard signal service, severed the line 150 meters deep in

the Soviet territory, set up a pole and fixed the letter to that pole.

CROSS

The contents of those letters was approximately the same; I mean, the contents of the letter which was delivered by the trespassers and the contents of the letter which was left by an armed Japanese detachment.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

13 14

2

7.

8

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

Leftler & Wolf

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

BY WR. FURNESS (Continued):

Q Now, before I for et it, how far is Novokievsk from Hill Zaozernaya?

A Novokievsk is about 30 or 35 kilometers from the Zaozernaya Hill; I have no exact recollection.

Q And units of the Red Army were stationed there at that time, were they not?

A Yes, at that time there were units of the regular Red Army.

Q And when you called for help, you called on the Commander of those units, did you not?

A I did not personally turn to the Commander of those units for help, but I called for help through my headquarters.

Q Now, to return to these letters -- the last one was dated the 23rd -- on either occasion were the persons who brought those letters detained by the Soviet Border-guards?

A The first of these who brought the first letter, that is, the trespassers, were detained.

I haven't finished.

Q Go ahead.

2

10 11

8

9

13 14

12

15

16

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

8 9

11 12

10

13 14

15 16

17 18

> 20 21

19

22 23

24 25

(Continuing) The members of the armed detachment which brought in second letter were not detained.

Q And when were the bearers of the first letter returned?

A I didn't catch it.

When were they returned across the State borderline as claimed by the Russians?

Neither the first letter which was brought by the trespassers nor the second letter were returned.

I think you misunderstood me. I said the bearers of that first letter who were detained. When were the men who brought that first letter returned?

The bearers of the letter -- the trespassers of the border, that is -- were turned over personally by me on July 24, 1938 to the Japanese authorities in the vicinity of Border Monument 8.

And is that near Hill Zaozernaya?

No, that was not near the Zaozernaya Hill; very far from the Hill, about 50-60 kilometers. I turned the trespassers over to the Japanese authorities in the vicinity of the Border Monument 8, and that is 50-60 kilometers from the Zaozernaya Hill.

You have now seid that twice. Who were the Japanese authorities?

that you detained?

A I don't remember exactly the names now, but
a special reciprocal protocol was signed by both parties
at that time in Russian and Japanese. Those persons
belonged to the Japanese Army in the rank of Major.
The Japanese Consul in Hanchun was present while those

persons were turned over.

Q What nationality or race were the two persons

THE PRESIDENT: Has he not already told you so?

A Chinese or Japanese; I don't exactly remember now.

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: "Chinese or Koreans."

Q Now, at the last paragraph of that letter it says, page 5 of exhibit 753: "The questions which recently arose between us is becoming tense, we are always ready to start negotiations on the frontier line of our post Khunchun. I want to know your opinion."

You testified that the gist of the two letters were the same and that the first letter came from the Commander of the Japanese Hanchun Detachment. Did you answer the letters anyway?

A Ne, I didn't reply to any of these letters.

Q Did you make --

A I haven't completed my reply, Mr. Counsel.

11

8

9

10

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

A That was beyond the scope of my functions -of my duties -- to reply to these letters because
the letters -- the reply to these letters had been
already given by the Government -- by the Soviet
Government.

Q Did you make any effort to get in touch with the Japanese or Manchukuon authorities as requested in those letters?

A I have answered you already that I didn't give any answer to those letters because it was out of the scope of my duties, and matters of such kind in our country are not decided by a single man.

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: Addition: "I was not authorized to answer these letters."

A (Continuing) Those letters were answered by Peoples' Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Litvinov, and I knew about that from our newspapers.

.

3.

4

,

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

21 22

23

24

25

Q Now, you testified that after you received these letters you started to prepare against an attack. What did you do?

CROSS

A As soon as I received those letters, especially the first one, after the trespassers had been turned over, I, along with a group of officers, went out to the Zaozernaya Hill.

Words of your affidavit, middle of page 3: "Having got such indications" -- the last reference is to the letters -- "we started to prepare against an attack on us in the Lake Khassan Area." Just what did you do to prepare?

A I have told you already that I went to the Zaozernaya Hill along with a group of officers and then I sent as many border guards as I could to the Zaozernaya Hill, and I have told you before that there were twentynine of them there.

Q This first letter --

A (Continuing) I haven't finished.

I also personally observed the conduct of the Japanese troops and instructed my officers to do so.

Q But this first letter was, according to testimony already introduced in this case by the prosecution, dated the 16th of July -- delivered the 16th of July. What did you do after the 16th of July?

A Subsequent to July 16, that is, after the receipt of the first letter, no special measures were taken. Only the observation of the Manchurian territory was intensified, and I was awaiting instructions as to the results of the letter from the superior headquarters.

Q But even though you expected an attack, you built no trenches, strung no barbed wire, and built no fortifications even on the Soviet side of the border, is that correct?

A Yes, we constructed no trenches and no fortifications because as I told you previously instructions of the Chief of the Department of the Border Corps categorically forbid us to do that.

Q You made no start to fortify even on the 11th of July or the 15th of July or at any other time then, as I understand it.

A Yes. As I previously testified, prior to 31
July 1938, that is, prior to the arrival of the field
troops, no trench works were carried out there, but subsequent to July 31, when the field troops had arrived in
the area, these field troops undertook some trench works,
but 'he depth of the trenches was no more than a lyingin trench or sitting-in trench. These trenches were dug
by the Soviet soldiers to reduce the number of caualties

10

12

14

15 16

17

19

20 21

22

23

territory.

from bullets and fragments and served as centers of re-

6

9

10 11

12 13

> 14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

sistance to repulse the Japanese attack and to launch counter attacks when the Japanese troops broke into our

It is impossible to undertake any trench work on the Zaozernaya Hill. It is a stone cliff and the earth crust is only fifteen to twenty centimeters. So this contention is wrong.

I am asking you questions now. Please answer them without going into quite so much detail.

Now, this Hill Zaozernaya, you have testified that the eastern slope is steep. The slope on the western side was at first gradual and then turned sharply downward, did it not?

The western slopes of the Zaozernaya Hill are even more steep, and they somewhat resemble -- somewhat remind you of ravines, and you can see it on the map as well as in the actual place.

Now, this Zaozernay Hill is a long ridge, is it not, which extends from southeast to northwest?

The water-shed ridge of the Zaozernaya Hill along the border line amounts to approximately two hundred meters. The breadth of the water-shed ridge of the Zaozernaya Hill amounts to two, sometimes to six, a ' no more than fifteen meters. Thus, the water-shed ridge of the Zaozernaya Hill is very distinctly shown.

a 1 p 2 e a 3 u 4 & 5 K n 6

K

Q I asked you whether there was a long ridge running from southeast to northwest. Now, can you give me an answer as to whether or not that is a correct statement?

A No, the water shed ridge of Zaozernaya Hill, that is, at the top of the hill, is passing in the direction from south to north.

And the state borderline as claimed by the soviets extends the length of that ridge, dees it?

A Yes, the state border in accordance with the Hunchun Protocol and the map attached thereto passes along that ridge.

You say that on July 26 you went to observe what was going on with a group of officers at the Zaczernaya outpost in order to observe on the spot what was happening. Was that the first time that you went to that outpost to see what was happening, after July 11?

A Yes, the date mentioned by you, Mr. Defense Counsel, that is, July 26, 1938, is quite correct.

And that was the first time that you observed Japanese troops?

A No, the Japanese troops had been observed before, that is, in the early part of July 1938.

Q I said you personally.

A No, I was at the Zaozernaya Hill several times

p 8

12

10

13

15

16

18

19 20

21

22

23

GREBENNIK

2

11 12

10

15

16

17 18

> 20 21

19

23 24

22

25

too, and during five years of my service in that sector of the border I frequently went to the Zaozernaya Hill because there was the junction of the three state borders and this place called for special attention.

I said that was the first time you observed Japanese troops crossing the Tumen River?

A No, I have already told you that I had seen the Japanese troops before at the very beginning of July; I don't remember the exact date.

But on that particular --

A I haven't completed my reply, Mr. Counsel.

I observed about a platoon of Japanese infantry at the very beginning of July who were establishing wire communication from Rumenula in the direction of the Zaozernaya Hill. The beginning of that wire was very hard to observe because it was hidden behind the natural rises.

Now, you saw the troops crossing on July 26. Were they withdrawn the following day?

A Beginning from July 26, 1938 I personally and my post observed the Japanese crossing the Tumen Ula River from the western bank onto the eastern bank, and they didn't return back.

Q Now, the troops crossing were infantry troops, were they not?

GREBENNIK

I haven't completed my answer, Mr. Counsel.

2

Q Well, if you would start immediately after the light went out I would know that, but you seemed to have completed it and I could not tell.

4

I asked you whether they had withdrawn, whether they did withdraw, and you say they did not and that seems to be an answer to my question.

7

A But I wanted to add a few words, saying that they didn't withdraw the troops, and I personally as well as the posts of the Soviet troops established the fact that the number of Japanese troops which were crossing the river were approximately 3,800 men.

10

11

12

Q You said that in your affidavit, and you have

13

said it three times now.

Now, it was only infantry that was brought across,

15 16

was it not?

A Yes, infantry units and small calibre artillery

19

17

were crossed to the eastern bank of the river, to the Manchurian territory.

20

They were $37\frac{1}{2}$ milimeter anti-tank guns and trench mortars, were they not?

22

A Yes, the guns were approximately 37 or 40 milimeters.

24

25

23

O Now, with regard to the fighting, I will put you a question which was put to one of the defense witnesses

by General Vasiliev: "You, as a military man, understand, certainly, that during the course of fighting some definite line could have been violated by any of these parties?" He means the opposing parties. What is your answer to that?

I will try to reply to your question objectively and accurately. Neither --

CROSS

And briefly, I hope.

ever crossed the frontier in the course of fighting,
because they were categorically forbidden from so doing.

But since the field troops were not very well femiliar
with the country, special officers -- special border
guard officers were detailed who were very well familiar
with the border to assist the field troops. They were
detailed as guides, but of course it is possible that
during the fighting some wounded soldier or officer
who were trying to get into the rear and were unfamiliar
with the sector and hiding behind the natural rises,
could have violated the border, but I know of no such
cases.

The direction as to non-violation of the border came from superior headquarters, with a view of not to expand hostilities in Lake Khassan area, not to give any pretext to the Japanese aggressors to develop or expand hostilities.

Q And that order applied to firing across the border, did it?

A ves, this order also applied to the firing across the border.

a So that even in the course of heavy fighting at night and fog you can testify that no Soviet border

1

15

16

17

19

21

22

24

38,335

guard and no member of the Red Army crossed the border or fired across the border except in an effort to escape?

A Yes, I have already testified that neither the Soviet border guards nor the Soviet troops ever crossed the border; but in the course of fighting there might have been such cases when shells or bullets exploded where the Japanese troops participating in the fighting were located.

o so you did fire across the border, is that correct?

A ves, in those cases when the Japanese troops were directly near the border and in front of the Soviet troops and were firing at the Soviet troops, the Soviet troops opened the fire in reply, and therefore the shells or bullets exploded on the territory occupied by the Japanese troops.

O Then did the Soviet artillery come up to the fighting?

A The Soviet artillery arrived on the 1st of August, 1938.

o You did not have any artillery in action on the 31st of July at any time, is that correct?

A On July 31 there was no artillery action on the part of the Soviet troops and Soviet border guards

2

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

2.5

because there was no artillery in that area at that time.

Now, without crossing the state border and without intentionally firing across the state border, as I understand it, the Russian troops wiped out an entire Japanese division, is that correct?

A Yes, the part of the division which participated in the action was wiped out, and likewise the gun positions which rendered assistance to the attacking units were also wiped out.

O Then, only a part of a division participated, is that correct?

A No, not a part of the division but the whole division took part in the fighting.

Q Now, how long were you at the scene of the fighting?

A I was at the scene of fighting from July 26 till August 10, as I have testified before.

Q You were there when hostilities ceased, were you?

A No, at that time I was not at the scene of the fighting, because I left the scene of the fighting on August 10, 1938.

Q The fighting ended at noon on August 11, 1938, is that correct?

2

5

8

9

10

11

12

14

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

2.5

38,337

2

4

6

8

10

11

12 13

14 15

18

19

20

17

16

21 22

24

23

A Yes, but not quite so. The fighting actually ceased at 12:05, because according to the agreement the Japanese were supposed to cease fighting at 12:00 sharp, but they didn't do so.

They ceased at five minutes after the hour, is that correct?

A Fractly as you say.

Q And according to the agreement the troops of both parties were to continue at the line that they then held?

A ves. The Soviet troops were along the border, and the Japanese troops were after the attack on their territory, and subsequent to August 11 they were withdrawn completely to the west bank of the Tuman-Ula River.

O The line as of the close of fighting, then was exactly to a meter the line as claimed by the Soviet authorities, is that correct?

A Yes. After the attack and after the Soviet troops had wiped out the Japanese division, the border line remained as it was defined by the Hunchun protocol.

RUSSIAN MONITOR: Correction: Instead of "wiped out" it should be "repulsed."

But the line at the end of the fighting was exactly to a meter the border line as claimed by the

All

Soviets? Can you answer that question? That is the question I asked you.

A ves. I have already replied that the border was 1 stored in accordance with the Hunchun agreement after the fighting.

And after that the Soviet Red Army troops withdrew and there remained only on the bordor the Soviet bolder guards?

Yes, after the hostilities ceased the regular field units were withdrawn and only border guards remained in that area.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

16

12

13

14

15

17

18 19

20

21

22

23 24

AFTERNOON SESSION G r 1 e 2 The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330. n b 3 MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International e r '4 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. g 5 THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness. 8 6 Is this cross-examination likely to take much Y eld longer, Major? 8 MR. FURNESS: No, sir. 9 10 GREBENNIK, called as a KUZMA Y. 11 witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the 12 stand and testified through Russian interpreters 13 as follows: 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION 15 16 BY MR. FURNESS (Continued): Q Can you tell me whether General Stern commanded 17 the Soviet troops along the frontier during the course 18 19 of the hostilities? 20 THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev. 21 GENERAL VASILIEV: The question is absolutely 22 irrelevant to the issues involved in the case and, 23 therefore, I object. 24 THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNESS: Your Honor, he has answered

already and it seems to me that if he testifies to
the hostilities it is perfectly within the affidavit
to ask him who commanded the troops on the Russian side
during the hostilities.

THE PRESIDENT: I cannot see how it matters to you, but it may.

MR. FURNESS: I am satisfied with his answer to the question which other counsel asked me to ask.

Q The equipment used by the Japanese was not motorized, was it?

A No, no mechanized troops participated on the part of the Japanese.

MR. FURNESS: No further cross-examination, your Honor.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: If the Tribunal please, the witness KANDA was yesterday stood down for possible cross-examination. Today, in order that the witness need not be kept waiting unnecessarily, I should like to say that we shall not cross-examine, merely referring

2.

1

4

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

19

21

22

23

2.5

the Tribunal to the cross-examination of the witness KASAHARA in connection with this same point on pages 7630-7639 of the transcript.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

GENERAL VASILIEV: We now offer in evidence IPS document No. 3294, the Certificate of the Military Topographic Department of the USSR General Staff with geographical maps published in different countries of the world attached thereto which show the correct border line in the Khalkin-gol area, that is, east of the river. The defense has introduced in evidence a map of 1933 published in the USSR which showed the border line as claimed by the Japanese and Manchukyo side, that is, along the Halha River. (Exhibit 2713, record 23,844.)

To rebut this evidence of the defense we present this certificate which points out an error made in the map published in 1933, the reason thereof and the timely steps immediately taken in order to correct this error.

THE PRESIDENT: The witness KANDA is excused on the usual terms.

Major Blakeney.

25

24

1

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. BLAKENEY: I wish to take several objections to this document now tendered. This curious certificate is a confession by the Soviet authorities that they had, as they say, committed an error in showing the boundary line on their maps. Inasmuch as they proceed, in the supplement of this document and other documents, to show the large quantity of materials which they had available and which showed the boundary to be as they now contend it always to have been, this confession of error must now, it is submitted, sound a little unconvincing and must, in consequence, have very little or no importance for the Tribunal in helping it to determine the issue of this frontier.

However, to paraphrase the words of one of the Russian prosecutors when this matter was originally presented to the Tribunal, this merely confirms that the Soviet authorities annexed this territory by changing the boundary on the map. At the very most, I submit, material of this type would tend to show that there was such a genuine confusion concerning the true location of the boundary as to negative any aggressive intent by either side in commencing an incident of this type, that is to say, Nomonhan, to which these maps relate.

2 3

As an additional ground of objection, I wish to refer to the form of this document which, while denominated a certificate, is in actuality an affidavit; and I respectfully submit that a witness who undertakes to testify to an error having been made and to the means adopted to correct it should be produced for cross-examination under the rather peculiar circumstances if his testimony is to be allowed any probative value. And we, therefore, object to the reception of this document unless the

affiant be produced for cross-examination.

Additionally, if the various documents listed and referred to herein as being attached sheets are to be offered, I shall have specific objections to some of them which, however, I assume I may properly reserve until each of them is offered. If I may, I should point out that these numerous document all have the same number but, I assume, will be tendered individually.

THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

correct, the defense counsel called this document several times "curious." This document emanates from a Soviet governmental office, and the observation of the defense counsel Blakeney is simply not serious

7 8

and does not deserve to be answered. This document is in full conformity with all the requirements of this Tribunal in accordance both with the Charter and with the rules of procedure. It can by no means be equated with an affidavit, and documents of this kind were several times admitted by this Tribunal. An error is an error, and it is dealt with in this document, and I submit it is fairly convincingly explained why it took place. And the best explanation lies in many maps of American and British origin which show the borderline in that sector. And as to the rest of the statement, it is all a matter of argument, and, I submit, now is not the proper stage for it, and it is a matter for the Tribunal to decide who introduced the confusion and for what purpose.

I call the attention of the Tribunal to the fact that the maps are appendices to the certificate.

Therefore, I ask that the document be admitted in

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled and the document is admitted on the . usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3294 will receive exhibit No. 3855.

evidence.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3855 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL VASILIEV: I shall read the exhibit:

"CERTIFICATE

"In 1933 the VIIth sheet of the map of the Asiatic part of the U.S.S.R. (scale 1" = 100 versts) was republished.

"The state border line between the Mongolian People's Republic and Manchuria in the Lake Buir-Nur area was erroneously marked on this sheet not to the east of the Khalkin-gol River as it should have been done but on the river itself.

"The following Japanese maps were used during the drawing of the state border line between the Mongolian People's Republic and Manchuria:

"1. The map of manchuria, Chahar and Outer mongolia published in 1933 by military authorities of manchukuo.

Scale: 1:500,000 (Supplement N. 1)

"2. The map of manchuria, North China and Korea published in 1931 by Cartography Department.

Scale: 1:2,500,000 (Supplement N. 2)

"After the VII the sheet had been republished

4

20

2

3

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

24

the error in the state border line between Mongolian People's Republic and Manchuria was discovered on this sheet, and measures were taken to study cartographic materials available in the archives, geographical atlases of various countries and documentary materials of the mongolian People's Republic Government relating to the Lake Buir-Nur area.

*These materials corroborated that the state border between Mongolian People's Republic and Manchuria as shown on the VIIth sheet of the map (scale 1" = 100 versts) is wrong and therefore afterwards when maps of any scales were published the border between the Mongolian People's Republic and Manchuria was marked to the east of the Khalkin-gol River, that is, where it actually passes in the area.

"This is corroborated by the attached sheets of the following maps:

"1. VIIth sheet of the map with the scale 1" - 40 versts (Blagovestchensk, Tsitsihar) published in 1935 by the Red Army Military Topographic Department. (Supplement N 3)

"2. Sheet L-50-B published in 1936 by the Red Army Military Topographic Department. Scale: 1:500,000. (Supplement N 4)

Sheet L-50-III, eastern part, published

19 20

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

in 1936 by the Red Army Military Topographic Department. Scale: 1:200,000 (Supplement N 5)

"The attached photostat-copies of maps taken from the Central Archives of the Military Topographic Department and from geographical atlases of various countries also corroborate that the state border between the Mongolian People's Republic and Manchuria runs not on the Khalkin-gol River, but to the east of it:

- Geographical map of Heilunghiang, Scale: 1:2,000,000 (Supplement N 6)
- "2). Training map of the Mongolian People's Republic published in Leipzig, Scale: 1:2,000,000 (Supplement N 7)
- "3). The map of the Mongolian People's Republic published in Shanghai (Supplement N 8)
- "4). The Map of China (The Handy Royal Atlas of Modern Geography. Yohnston. pp. 62-63. Published in London, in 1927) (Supplement N 9)
- "5). The Map of Eastern Siberia. (Stieler's Hand-Atlas. Justus Perthes. 1905. Gotha, p. 58) (Supplement N 10)
- "6). The Map of China (New Handy General Atlas. George Philip. London, 1930. pp. 123-124) (Supplement N 11)

21

1

2

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22 23

24

"7). The Map of China and Japan. (World Atlas. Rand McNally & Company. New York, 1932-1933, pp. 152-153) (Supplement N 12)

"8). The Map of China and Japan (The Times Handy Atlas. John Bartholomew, London, 1935, pp. 64-65)

(Supplement N 13)

"9). The Map of China and Japan (The Citizen's Atlas of the World. Bartholomew, London, 1935.

pp. 112-113) (Supplement N 14)

"10). The Map entitled: 'Asia, the states and a survey of the means of communication.'
(Columbus Weltatlas. Paul Oestergard, Berlin, 1937, pp. 47-48) (Supplement N 15)

"11). The Map of East Asia. (Cappelens Verdens Atlas. Cappelens, Oslo, 1937. p. 33 (II).) (Supplement N 16)."

THE PRESIDENT: General, what have you to say in answer to the following observation by a Member of the Tribunal: We know nothing about the materials used in preparing these maps; moreover, only three out of the eleven are proof in date to the map alleged to be erroneous?

Morse & Whalen

rectly I will reply as follows: In the very beginning of the certificate two Japanese maps were indicated which served as a basis of the error if the torder line was copied from them, the border line in that sector -- because the border line was copied from them. The reason is that we are referring to the border not of the Soviet state, and it is only natural that foreign maps were used to show this border, and that was the reason for the mistake.

May I complete my reply?

THE PRESIDENT: I am not preventing you.

GENERAL VASILIEV: And additionally, maybe
I didn't hear you correctly, not two or three maps
are attached, maps relating to the period prior to the
conflict, but much more, as may be seen from the enumeration.

THE PRESIDENT: The suggestion is that only three out of the eleven are prior to the date -- are prior in date to the map alleged to be erroneous.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I misunderstood you. I
was referring to our maps, and as far as foreign maps
are concerned -- I misunderstood you.

I was referring to foreign maps, and as far as our maps are concerned there are three of them indeed.

19

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

23

I presume it is clear from the certificate that these are not all the maps but just some of them taken for example.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: In renewing the request for the alternative production of the witness or disregarding of this testimony, I might also point out that of those few maps herein enumerated published after the allegedly erroneous Soviet map, at least three which I have noted show the frontier to be not where it is claimed on the corrected Soviet map but where it stood on the original one, for example, Nos. 9 and 10 which show the frontier distinctly to be west of the Khalkin-gol. I think these clearly demonstrate the probative value of this testimony in the absence of cross-examination.

GENERAL VASILIEV: I submit that the motion to produce the person who signed this document for cross-examination is merely an attempt to create unsurpassable obstacles for us, because it is quite clear that within the few days before the summation we will have no time to bring the witness here. And, additionally, there is no need to do so.

And as far as the appraisal of this document is concerned, I submit that this is a matter of the

25

1

2

3

5

9

10:

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

future and it is a matter for the Tribunal to decide whether these documents are -- Correction: And I submit there is no need to prove how convincing these documents are.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, this whole question is:
What is necessary in the interests of justice. We
will consider whether it is necessary to call the person who is responsible for these maps for crossexamination.

GENERAL VASILIEV: The Latest Great Map of China, published in Japan in 1932, which shows the correct border line in the vicinity of the Khalkin-gol River east of the river is now offered in evidence to rebut the evidence of the defense to the effect that on the Japanese maps the border ran along the river, record 23,842.

RUSSIAN MONITOR: And I offer in evidence this document, the number of which is 2993-C.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I object to this document as having no probative value and being unimportant. This is a map by a private publisher, in no sense official, published by a book store somewhere, and is purely cumulative when added to the large collection of such maps just now admitted into evidence. I submit that

4 5

additional maps of this type can have no importance to the Tribunal.

GENERAL VASILIEV: Although it is true that the map was published by a publishing house -- Correction: By a book store, but it is clear that he didn't invent that map himself, and it only confirms that the general idea about the border was such as it is shown on the map. Additionally I should like to state that this map was borrowed from the Tokyo Imperial Library which shows that the map carries certain weight and it trustworthy.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Map entitled "Latest Great Map of the Chinese Republic" will receive exhibit No. 3856 for identification only; the photostatic portion thereof, being prosecution document 2993-C, will receive exhibit No. 3856-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3856, the excerpt therefrom being marked prosecution exhibit No. 3856-A and received in evidence.)

2 3

7

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

GENERAL VASILIEV: The evidence presented by the defense contains a claim that in the vicinity of the Khalkin-gol River the border followed the course of the river in conformity with historical Chinese maps, record 22,995 through 97.

To rebut this contention we offer in evidence IPS document 3024, a historical Chinese map drawn in 1858. It comprises an explanatory note of the Foreign Ministry of the Mongolian People's Republic, the inscription on the map and the map itself as well as the letter of the Chinese dignitary Beise who in 1858 clarified the border in the Khalkin-gol area by order of the Manchurian Emperor.

These two documents are marked "b" and "c".

Since this historical map and the documents attached thereto are written in Mongolian and, in addition, the map was drawn by specific methods different from those used nowadays, it became necessary to translate it into comprehensible symbols.

We also tender in evidence the affidevits of KITADA, Koso, Doctor of Cartography, and HATTORI, Shiso, professor of linguistics, IPS documents 3024-d and e.

These Japanese scientists certify that the historical Chinese map of 1858 being translated to a

modern map shows the border line in conformity with the Mongolian-Soviet claim, that is, not along the course of the river but east of the river.

If the Tribunal admits these documents in evidence the witnesses may be immediately brought in as they are now in the witness room.

THE PRESIDENT: Before we get on to this document, I have a question by a Member of the Tribunal
on the exhibit 3856-A just admitted: Are you submitting
that the border in question was a China-Manchuria
border? He points out that it is entitled "The Latest
Great Map of the Chinese Republic."

understand, to the border between the so-called Inner and Outer Mongolia. The Outer Mongolia, which is now Mongolian Peoples' Republic, was formerly part of China, and it is only natural that in showing the borders of China in the present sense of this word that the borders with the neighboring countries should be marked.

MR. BLAKENEY: Shall I proceed, your Honor?

THE PRESIDENT: We will proceed with the document last tendered, IPS document 3024B and C.

Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: Yes. There were, in fact, four

.

24

19

20

21

22

23

documents tendered as a group, but I shall discuss them, of course, individually.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I haven't been handed four, but it doesn't matter. Go shead.

MR. BLAKENEY: 3024B consists of a variety of matter, the chief part of which seems to be the so-called explanatory note. The explanatory note is, of course, nothing more nor less than testimony, an affidavit, and I call attention to the fact that it was plainly prepared for use in this trial, being dated the 8th of December 1946 which is some two and a half months after the conclusion of the presentation of the Soviet case in chief but roughly half a year before the presentation of the defense's Soviet case. We, therefore, submit, it could in no conceivable way be rebuttal or answer. Therefore, my first point is that this man Sanjimitab should certainly be brought here as a witness to stand cross-examination on this matter rather than testifying to it through this document.

By the way, although the witness Sanjimitab signs himself as an official of the Mongolian People's Republic, the certificate of translation of the document shows it translated apparently from Russian to English. Therefore, I presume that we have here one

3

1

6

8

10

11 12

> 13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

of several cases to appear later of double translation, Mongolian to Russian, Russian to English, with all of the well-known dangers which that entails.

In addition to those things, this witness purports to testify concerning certain documents some of which are not produced. The map referred to in paragraph 1 purports to be annexed although in actuality what is annexed is a hand drawn sketch, and quite obviously not prepared in the Mongolian or the Manchurian language in the year 1858. By the way, on page 4 of this document the year of the map is given as 1838. The pages are not numbered but I am referring to a certificate, the first of two by Maurin of the International Prosecution Section.

THE PRESIDENT: According to the copies given to General Cramer and myself the map was drawn by a Manchurian minister Jagdan in 1734. That can't be right. I should say, it could be right but it isn't likely.

MR. BLAKENEY: That, your Honor, I was just going to say is the map referred to in paragraph 2 which appears to be a totally distinct map and as to production of which there is no effort here made.

THE PRESIDENT: I must correct myself.

. 1

MR. BLAKENEY: But my point, of course, is that that map was not produced or tendered.

Paragraph 3 of this so-called explanatory
note starts off, "As is shown by historical documents,"
and then proceeds to summarize and give conclusions as
to what is shown by those historical documents for the
remainder of the page.

THE PRESIDENT: This boundary question may call for a major investigation, which we may not be able to undertake at this stage. It may involve the close inspection of ancient documents not immediately available.

MR. BLAKENEY: Finally, I was going to say, to demonstrate what I consider to be the absolute unimportance of this document, that this author proceeds to say that the contents of some of these historical documents are conclusive proof of the ownership of the territory, but he doesn't condescend to let us see the parts from which he forms that conclusion.

I assume it would be more convenient to your Honors to rule on this one before I mention the other documents also tendered.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

.16

MR. BLAKENEY: Shall I proceed with my objection to the second of the documents?

GENERAL VASILIEV: There is no need to do so because I am not going to present it since they are very closely related to each other.

May the witness Bykov be called?

_

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

3

A. E. B Y K O V, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, being first duly sworn, testified through Russian interpreters as follows: GENERAL VASILIEV: May the witness be shown

IPS document 3151?

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY GENERAL VASILIEV:

- Q What is your first and last name?
- A Bykov, Afinogon Erastovich.
- Q Your military rank?
- A Major.
- Q Will you examine IPS document No. 3151?

Is this your interrogation; is this your affidavit?

- A Yes, that is my affidavit.
- Q Are all the statements therein true and correct?
 - A Yes, true and correct.

2

22

24

GENERAL VASILIEV: I now offer in evidence
the affidavit of Major Bykov, whose testimony in regard
to the Halhin-Gol events is embodied in IPS document
3151.

5

1

0

.

9

11 12

13

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

This evidence is presented in rebuttal of the evidence presented by the defense to the following . Affect:

The right bank of the Halka River was not guarded by Mongolian border guards and the border followed the course of the river, record 22,998 through 23,029.

The Mongolian troops were the first to open hostilities and occupied the eastern bank of the river, record 22,595, 23,029, 23,016.

Major Bykov was in command of the first Soviet unit put into action against the Manchukuo and Japanese forces and is an eyewitness of all the events from beginning to end. His testimony would be of great importance to the Tribunal and from the legal stand-point is quite proper for this stage of the trial.

THE PRESIDENT: No objection? The document is admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3151 will receive exhibit No. 3857.

(Whereupon, the document above

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

referred to was marked prosecution's exhibit No. 3857 and received in evidence.)

GENERAL V/SILIEV: I shall read the exhibit, omitting the formal parts.

"1. In 1939, I served in the Soviet forces on the territory of the Mongolian People's Republic.

At that time my rank was senior lieutenant and I commanded a mechanized rifle battalion of the 11th tank brigade stationed in the town of Under-han.

"On March 1, 1939, Major General Yakovlev, brigade commander, put me in command of a mixed detachment and ordered to march with the detachment to the area of the Mongolian town Tamtsak-Bulak 120-130 kilometers west of the Halhin-Gol river. As Major General Yakovlev explained to me the purpose of sending the mixed detachment was as follows: in the Halhin-Gol river area, on the sector guarded by the 7th Mongolian frontier guard outpost increased the cases of the boundary line being crossed by the Japanese troops and there were cases when the Japanese kidnapped the Mongolian tsiriks (soldiers) and officers and took them to the Manchurian territory. The purpose of having the Soviet mixed detachment in that area was to prevent the Japanese from similar unlawful actions directed against the Mongolian border guards.

14

16 17

18

20

21

23 24

4

1

5

10

11 12

14 15

13

16 17

> 18 19

20 21

22 23

24

25

"My mechanized rifle battalion reinforced with an armoured-car (BA-6) company, with a battery of 76mm. self-propelled guns (4 guns) and with a battery of 122mm. howitzers (4 howitzers) was a part of the mixed detachment placed under my command.

"On May 28, 1939, this detachment was the first unit of Soviet regular troops which engaged in battle with the Japanese Manchurian troops crossing the border of the Mongolian People's Republic east of the Halhin-Gol river and seizing the part of the Mongolian territory on the eastern bank of that river.

"2. On March 5, 1939, the detachment arrived in the area of the town Tamtsak-Bulak and was stationed there.

"In the town Tamtsak-Bulak was also stationed the 6th Mongolian cavalry division.

"East of Tamtsak-Bulak were neither Mongolian nor Soviet regular troops, but only the Mongolian border guard outposts.

"3. In so far as the violations of the border were perpetrated by the Japanese on the sector guarded by the 7th Mongolian border guard outpost I went to that outpost in March 1939 in order to investigate the situation at the border.

"The 7th border guard outpost guarded the

6

8

9 10

11

12 13

14 15

> 16 17

18

20

19

21 22

23

24

25

sector of the state border of the Mongolian People's Republic east of the Halhin-Gol river beginning from Eris-Ulin-Obo and further to the north in a straight line to Hulat-Ulin-Obo and from that place also in a straight line to Nomongan-Burd-Obo.

"In such a way the territory guarded by the outpost was on the eastern bank of the Halhin-Gol river 20-22 kilometers in depth in the direction of Nomongan-Burd-Obo east of the river.

"The sector of the border guarded by the outpost ended a few kilometers north of the place Nomongen-Burd-Obo.

"The bulk of the outpost was on the western bank of the river in the Sumburin-Tsagan-Nur lake area. The outpost daily sent patrols to and set posts on the eastern bank of the river.

"The eastern bank of the river was very carefully guarded by Mongolian border guards especially in connection with systematic violations of the state border in that area perpetrated by the Japanese-Manchurian troops beginning from January 1939."

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

& L

10

12 13 14

11

15 16

> 18 19

17

21 22

20

23 24

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed THE PRESIDENT: General Vasiliev.

DIRECT

GENERAL VASILIEV: I resume the reading of the affidavit of the witness Bykov.

"4. On the night of May 14-15, 1939, the headquarters of the 6th Mongolian cavalry division received a report from the 7th border guard outpost to the effect that on May 11 the Japanese-Manchurian cavalry unit more than 200 men strong crossed the border in the Nomongan area and advanced 15-18 kilometers into the Mongolian territory.

"In a clash with that unit several Mongolian border guards were killed. On May 12, 1939, border guard reserves drove the violators of the border into the Manchurian territory.

"However, on May 14, 1939, up to two squadrons of the Japanese and Manchurians again crossed the border and advanced into the Mongolian territory on the eastern bank of the Halkin-gol river driving back the border guards.

"In connection with that report the Command of the 6th Mongolian division and I decided to go to the

location of the 7th border guard outpost to investigate

"About 35-40 kilometers from the 7th Mongolian border guard outpost we came across 2 mounted tsiriks (soldiers) riding on horseback at top speed in the western direction. We stopped them. The tsiriks were carrying a message from the chief of the outpost to the effect that 5 Japanese single-engined dive-bombers raided the outpost and made four bombing runs. During the first two runs the outpost was bombed and then during the last two the outpost was machine-gunned from the air.

"We went to the outpost at once and I myself saw the damage inflicted by the Japanese. Three tsiriks were killed, 25 were injured. I saw myself the traces of machine-gunning. On the same day we returned to Tamtsak-Bulak (we had motorcars). I put in a through call to the corps headquarters in Ulan Bator and reported about what had happened.

Mongolian division went to the Hamardaba mountain area on the western bank of the Halhin-gol river.

"By order of the corps headquarters my reconnaissance platoon went together with the 6th Mongolian cavalry division. The first minor clash of Soviet troops with Japanese-Manchurian troops took place on

4

6

.8

9

11 12

13

15

17 18

19

20

22

24

25

the corps headquarters I ordered my reconnaissance platoon to cross the Halhin-gol river to its eastern bank and to conduct the reconnaissance inforce on the Mongolian territory seized by the Japanese. I gave strict orders to the platoon commander under no circumstances to cross the state border line.

"The reconnaissance platoon went 7-8 kilometers

May 22 or 23 when in accordance with the instructions of

"The reconnaissance platoon went 7-8 kilometers to the east and without hindrance and being 12-13 kilometers from the state border line was fired upon by the enemy, surrounded, and fighting broke through the encirclement and withdrew to the western bank of the Halhin-gol river.

"6. On May 25 the 6th Mongolian cavalry division crossed the Halhin-gol river to its eastern bank and took up the defensive position 8-10 kilometers from the state border line. My detachment arrived at the Halhin-gol on May 24, 1939.

"On May 26 I, in accordance with orders, put across the river to its eastern bank two mechanized rifle companies, a battery of 45 mm. guns and a few armored cars. On May 27 I transferred our command post to the eastern bank of the Halhin-gol river, about 9-10 kilometers from the state border line.

"On May 26 and 27 Soviet-Mongolian units had no

battle contacts with the Japanese. We thought that the border incident was closed.

"7. However, on the night of May 27-28 the Japanese took up the offensive.

"It began at about 3 a.m. As I know from the testimony of those taken prisoner the offensive was conducted by a group (which was a part of the 23rd infantry division and Bargut cavalry) under the command of Colonel YAMAWATA, commander of the 64th infantry regiment of the 23rd infantry division.

"The group contained a part of the 64th infantry regiment, a reconnaissance detachment of the 23rd division under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel AZUMA, a motorized company under the command of Captain KAWANO, the 8th cavalry regiment and the units of the 1st and 7th Bargut cavalry regiments.

"The Japanese tried to outflank the Soviet troops from the left flank to appear in our rear and get to the Halhin-gol river crossing cutting off our way of retreat.

"Regular fighting took place in the course of which my detachment lost 65-70 officers and men. At the end of the day of May 28 a regiment of the 36th rifle division under the command of Major Remizov arrived at the Halhin-gol river. That regiment from the

3

6

5

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

march was thrown into action.

"This day may be considered as the date of the opening of large-scale hostilities on the Halhin-gol river between the Japanese who violated the border and the units of the Soviet army. Prior to May 28 major clashes of regular troops did not take place.

"8. I participated with my detachment in further battles and stayed in that area till the cessation of hostilities and the conclusion of truce. As a participant of those battles I can testify that in all the operations I had strict orders not to cross the state border line and those orders were never broken by me.

"I know that the commanders of other units had similar strict orders. I definitely know that during the hostilities there was not a single case of a border violation on the part of our troops or Mongolian units.

hostilities I can testify that after the Japanese had been defeated we did not follow them across the border though we had a chance of going forward up to Hailar without encountering resistance. After the cessation of hostilities we took up the defensive along the state border line which remained exactly in the same place in which it had run prior to May 11, 1939.

4

7

9

11

13

14 15

16

17

19

20

21 22

23 24

38,369 DIRECT вукоч "The affidavit is written in my own hand. "/s/ Major Bykov"

A

-

BY GENERAL VASILIEV (Continued):

Q Mr. Witness, do you know the total number of losses suffered by the Japanese side and how do you know that?

A The total losses suffered by the Japanese troops who participated in the conflict in the Nomongan area amounted to 52-55 thousand. This data is known to me from the analysis made by the -- from the analysis of the fighting operations made by the Commander of the corps in that area, Zhukov, which was done after the end of the hostilities. That analysis was done by unit commanders -- at the conference with unit commanders, and they were informed of the number of the Japanese losses.

GENERAL VASILIEV: May the witness be shown exhibit No. 766.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Will you please take a look at the map attached to this exhibit?

Have you examined the map?

- A Yes, I have examined the map.
- Q Do you know what map it is?
- A Yes, I know this map. This map was captured on May 28 from Lieutenant Colonel AZUMA, the Commanding

2

5

8

9

10

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Officer of the reconneissance detachment of the 23rd Division of the Japanese troops. The map was captured by Commanding Officer of the First Platoon of my company, Senior Lieutenant Seminov. It was found in the car which belonged to Lieutenant Colonel AZUMA. The car was put out of action by the battery of self-propelled guns. The same battery of self-propelled guns put out of action two armoured cars, which guarded the headquarters of Lieutenant Colonel AZUMA.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney.

MR. BLAKENEY: I think the question has been answered, your Honor. He knows what map it is.

Mr. Witness, is the border shown on this map correctly, according to the claim of the Soviet-Mongolian side?

The borderline is shown on this map in accordance with the contentions of the Soviet-Mongolian side.

Q Thus, the Japanese forces were operating, having in their possession a map which showed that that sector was Mongolian.

THE PRESIDENT: That is argument. We do not want that.

GENERAL VASILIEV: You may cross-examine.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Blakeney. CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q What were the Soviet and Mongolian losses in Nomongan?

A The losses of Soviet-Mongolian forces arounted to 9 to $9\frac{1}{2}$ thousand.

Q Now, Witness, were there or were there not any Soviet or Kongolian units on the east side of the Halhar River at the time you first came on the scene?

A By the moment of my arrival at the Halhar River there were no Soviet or Mongolian troops in that area.

MR. BLAKENEY: I couldn't understand that.

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: "...no Soviet or Mongolian troops in that area."

Q And you arrived there when?

A I with my detachment came to the Halhin-gol area on May 24.

Q And from the moment of your arrival, what Soviet or Mongolian forces were on the east bank of the Halhar River?

A When I arrived in that area, there were only my detachment and the th Mongolian Cavalry Division in the area of the Harardaba Hill.

3

5

6

7

2

8

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

22

23 24

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: Correction: "Ey the moment of my arrival at the west bank of the river," and instead of "my detachment," "my reconnaissance platoon."

Q How large is the Mongolian Cavalry Division?

A At that moment the 6th Mongolian Cavalry Division had 250 sabers.

Q And how many men in your unit?

A My unit consisted of 3 motorized infantry companies, 1 battery of 45-millimeter guns (4 guns), 1 battery of self-propelled guns of 76-millimeters (4 guns), 1 battery of 120 millimeter guns (4 guns), a reconnaissance platoon, consisting of 5 armoured cars, 1 armored company of 16 armored cars of BA-6 type.

THE RUSSIAN MONITOR: Addition: "The model of self-propelled guns was SU-76."

Q Now, you have said all that in your affidavit.

I want to know how many men there were in your unit.

A There were 1200 officers and men in my unit.

1 2 3

6

8

10

11

9

12 13

15

14

18

17

21.

20

24

23

Q And were those units which we have mentioned, yours and the 6th Mongolian Division, the only troops on the Soviet-Mongolian side in that area at that time?

A Yes. In that area there were only my mixed detachment and the 6th Mongolian Cavalry Division.

There were no other Soviet or Mongolian units in that area.

Q Now, at the time that you visited the border in March -- was it March -- 1939, what units were in that area?

A For the first time I was in the area guarded by the 7th Mongolian Border Outpost on the 12th or 13th of March. For the second time I was in the sector guarded by the 7th Mongolian Border Guard Outpost on May 15, 1939. Neither when I was there for the first time nor when I was there for the second time were there any Mongolian or Soviet troops in that area, except for the 7th Mongolian Border Guard Outpost.

What was its strength?

A Will you please repeat the question? To the strength of what unit are you referring?

K n a p D & K a

, 1

2

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

I am referring to the strength of the only unit that was in that area when you made your visits in March and May of 1939.

I repeat for the second time that during my first visit to that area and during my second visit to the same area there was only the Seventh Border Guard outpost of the Mongolian troops, and no other troops were in that area at that time. The Seventh Border Guard outpost consisted of 150 men and officers, or 200 men and officers.

- Where was its headquarters?
- What headquarters do you mean?
- I mean the headquarters of the only unit stationed in that area at the time of your visits in March and May of 1939.

The headquarters of my unit was in the town of Tamtsak Bulak, 150 to 200 -- 130 to 150 kilometers west of the Halhin-gol River.

You must understand that I am asking you about the headquarters of what you call the Seventh Mongolian Border Guard unit. Where was it?

Mr. Counsel, the Seventh Border outpost, as well as any other outpost, has no headquarters and has only its commanding officer.

Where was he?

19 20

21

22 23

24

STATE OF STREET	The second second			Santa - Santa - Santa -
A	Whom	do	VOII	mean?

- o I mean the commanding officer.
- A You mean the commanding officer of the Seventh Border outpost?
 - o Precisely so.

A The commanding officer of the Seventh Border

Guard outpost was with his outpost on the western bank

of the Halhin-gol River near the lake -- I don't remember

the name of the lake.

RUSSIAN MONITOR: With the main forces of his outpost.

- O A big lake or a small one?
- A A small lake, not far from the Khamar-Daba
- You say that the main force of the outpost was there with the commanding officer. Where was the remainder of it?
 - A (The witness started to examine papers.)
 - O Never mind looking at the map.

A The posts and the patrols of the Seventh Border Guard outpost were on the western bank of the Halhin-gol River. That is on the Mongolian territory. They were along the borderline and that means that they were about 20 or 22 kilometers from the river.

O Then, the entire border guard unit was on the

•

19

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Mt.

21

22

western bank of the Halhar River?

A I shall repeat again that the main force of the Seventh Border Guard outpost, the outpost which guarded the territory of the Mongolian State Border -- of the State Border of the Mongolian People's Republic, was on the west bank of the Halhar River near the Khamar-Daba Mount. As to the posts and patrols of the Seventh Border Guard outpost, they were located on the east side of the Halhar River, about 20 to 25 kilometers east of the river, and they were guarding the Mongolian State Border.

Now, was it east or west? You said it each way.

A Yes, I said before that the main force of the outpost was on the west of the bank, and patrols and posts which were sent out by these outposts were on the eastern bank of the river, 20 to 22 kilometers from the river -- to the east from the river. That is in the area where the Mongolian State borderline runs.

- O Was that in March or in May or both?
- A Both.
 - How far east of the river is the Mongolian border, as you understand it?
 - A The Mongolian State border is from 20 to 22 kilometers east of the river -- of the Halhar River.
 - At the time of your inspection of that area

in March did you yourself cross to the eastern bank of the Halhar River?

A Yes, in March I personally, together with the commanding officer of the Seventh Border Guard outpost, Junion Lieutenant Chogdon, was on the eastern bank of the Halher River and went along the border.

Did you at that time visit the various advance outposts of the Seventh Mongolian Border Guard?

A At that time I and the commanding officer of the Seventh Border outpost went along the state border, where posts and patrols were located, detailed from the Seventh Border Guard outpost.

O Did you at that time inspect all of those advance patrols?

A I had no connection whatsoever to the Seventh Border Guard outpost, and therefore I had no right to inspect it.

O I didn't ask you if you had a right; I asked you if you did it.

A I shall repeat once more that I was unable and not entitled to inspect the Seventh Border Guard outpost, since I was a Soviet officer -- since I am a Soviet officer.

Q and I repeat once more: Did you visit and inspect those outposts? You can answer that yes or no.

3 4

7 8

6

9

11

12

14

15 16

17

18

20

22 23 24

BYKOV-CROSS 38,379 I answer that I did not inspect the posts and patrols of the Seventh Border Guard outpost, and I was not authorized to do that. - 25

Did you visit the places where they were located? Yes, I and the commanding officer of the out-A post went along the border and saw where the posts and patrols guarding the state border were situated -- which guarded the Mongolian state border. Would you say that you saw all of them? I was not interested in the number of posts guarding the state borderline of the Mongolian People's Republic and therefore I do not know whether I saw all 10 11 of them or not. After the fighting started in this area, in 12 May, how long was the front? 13 The front was from 55 to 70 kilometers long. 14 Did the fighting go on only during the daylight 15 16 hours or did it continue at night? 17 What period do you have in mind? 18 THE PRESIDENT: You are not asked that. I can 19 think of only one thing, but you do not have to be told 20 what that is. 21 THE WITNESS: The question is not quite clear to 22 me. Will you please repeat it? 23 BY THE PRESIDENT: 24

25

Was there day and night fighting?

should you specify the period of time, whether

it was in May, June, July or August --1 If there was any night fighting, will you state what date? The first night fighting, or rather at dawn, occurred on lay 28. BY MR. BLAKENEY: Q And from time to time thereafter was there night fighting? A Yes, there was some night fighting after May 28, 10 from time to time. 11 Did the Soviet and Mongolian forces use aircraft in the course of the fighting at Nomonhan? 12 13 In what month? A 14 In any month. 15 Yes, the Soviet troops used aircraft. 16 Can you estimate how many, at any time? 17 I cannot tell the number of aircraft participat-18 ing in fighting. 19 What type of aircraft were they? 20 Fighters and bombers. Used against forces of the Japanese and Manchukuans? Only against the Japanese and Manchurian forces. A

Were their rear areas attacked?

Will you please clarify what you mean by "rear

areas"?

21

22

23

24

Rear headquarters, bases, supply depots, lines of communications. The aircraft bombed artillery positions and divisional dumps. And Japanese airfields? That I do not know. A 6 Where is Hailar located from Nomonhan? 0 Approximately from 120 to 150 kilometers. Do you know a thing about the attacks on Hailar? What attacks on Hailar do you mean? A 11 Any attack. 12 I mean whether you are referring to land attacks 13 or air attacks. 14 15 Either. There were neither land attacks nor air attacks 16 on Hailar from the side of the Japanese -- of the Soviet 17 18 and Mongolian troops. O Well, then, why did you ask me which kind I am 19 referring to? Where there some other kinds of attacks? 20 21 I asked you because I did not understand what 22 you were referring to and I wanted to clarify it. 23 How do you definitely know that during the 24 hostilities there was not a single case of a border

violation on the part of Soviet or Mongolian troops?

A I and my unit were the first engaged in the fighting and we were in that area till the end of the fighting, till the truce between the Soviet-Mongolian side and the Japanese-Manchurian side was signed, and I and all other commanding officers had strict instructions not to trespess or to violate the state borderline of the Mongolia. People's Republic.

Now, just a minute. I am not interested in your orders. You have already put that in your affidavit. I want to know how you know this fact which you state so dogmatically.

A Will you please give me a chance to finish my reply?

We don't want that digression or explanation, so please smit anything about your orders and state how you know this fact.

A If you wouldn't interrupt me and would give me a chance to finish my reply, then you would understand from what I do know about this fact --

SOVIET MONITOR: How I know about this fact.

o Tell us how you know.

A I shall repeat again that I participated in the fighting against the Japanese forces from the month of May and until the cessation of hostilities. During the August operation, that is, during the final operation

11

13

10

8

14

17

16

19

21

22

I and my unit belonged to the northern group of troops, and we were outflanking the Japanese on the west. We followed the northern part of the border, and the southern group of forces which outflanked the Japanese from the south did not violate the border either, so neither the northern nor the southern groups ever trespassed the border -- the state borderline.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast nine tomorgow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Wednesday, 28 January 1948, at 0930.)